

REMARKS

In the Office Action of April 24, 2008, claims 1-7, 20, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,260,424 (“Schmidt”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,565 (“Smith et al.”). In addition, claims 8-11, 13-18 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Schmidt in view of Smith and in further view of European Patent Application No. EP 0 800 283 (“Heinonen”), U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0017809 A1 (“Garlepp et al.”), U.S. Patent No. 6,128,486 (“Keskitalo et al.”) or U.S. Patent No. 6,844,862 (“Cencich et al.”).

In response, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 1, 20, 29 and 30 are not obvious in view of Schmidt and Smith et al., as explained below. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of the independent claims 1, 20, 29 and 30, as well as the dependent claims 2-11, 13-18 and 21-23.

I. Patentability of Independent Claims 1, 20, 29 and 30

The independent claim 1 recites in part “*an antenna terminal having a plurality of antennas connected to respective switches, each of the antennas having a transmission-connector for connecting the transmission path to the antenna and a reception-connector for connecting the reception path to the antenna, wherein the antenna-switch, controllable by the signal processor, allows multi-frequency operation of the antenna-terminal by combining a transmission-mode and a reception-mode of each of the antennas,*” which is not disclosed in the cited references of Schmidt and Smith et al. Thus, the independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of these cited references. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the independent claim 1 be allowed.

The Office Action correctly states on page 3 that the cited reference of Schmidt does not teach “an antenna terminal having a plurality of antennas connected

to respective switches, each of the antennas having a transmission-connector for connecting the transmission path to the antenna and a reception-connector for connecting the reception path to the antenna, wherein the antenna-switch, controllable by the signal processor, allows multi-frequency operation of the antenna-terminal by combining a transmission-mode and a reception-mode of each of the antennas, the signal processor controlling the respective switches of the multiple antennas such that, at a particular instant in time, each of the antennas is configured as either a transmit-only antenna or a receive-only antenna.” However, the Office Action then alleges that the cited reference of Smith et al. teaches “an antenna terminal having a plurality of antennas connected to respective switches, each of the antennas having a transmission-connector for connecting the transmission path to the antenna and a reception-connector for connecting the reception path to the antenna, wherein the antenna-switch, controllable by the signal processor, allows multi-frequency operation of the antenna-terminal by combining a transmission-mode and a reception-mode of each of the antennas (col. 8 lines 13-26 and col. 10 lines 24-39), the signal processor controlling the respective switches of the multiple antennas such that, at a particular instant in time, each of the antennas is configured as either a transmit-only antenna or a receive-only antenna (col. 4 lines 10-31 and col. 9 lines 41-62)” to derive the claimed invention of claim 1 by combining the teachings of Schmidt and Smith et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited reference of Smith et al. discloses a communication station 10 that includes a plurality of antennas 26 connected to an RF switch and two receiver-diversity antennas 44 connected to a receiver circuitry 38, as illustrated in Fig. 1. The antennas 26 are described in column 7, lines 22-34, and column 8, lines 13-26, as being used to transmit signals from transmitter elements 18, which are connected to the RF switch via lines 22. The RF switch is connected to the antennas 26 via lines similar to the lines 22. These lines between the RF switch and the antennas 26 can be viewed as transmission paths since the lines are used only for transmission of signals. The receiver-diversity antennas 44 are described in column 7, lines 50-61, as being used to receive signals, which are transmitted to the receiver circuitry 38 via lines. These lines between the receiver-diversity antennas 44 and the receiver circuitry 38 can be viewed as reception paths since the lines are used only for reception of signals. Therefore, each of the antennas 26 and 44 in Smith et al. is connected to either a

transmission path or a reception path. Thus, the cited reference of Smith fails to disclose “*each of the antennas having a transmission-connector for connecting the transmission path to the antenna and a reception-connector for connecting the reception path to the antenna,*” as recited in the independent claim 1. Consequently, even if the teachings of Schmidt and Smith et al. are combined, the claimed invention of claim 1 cannot be derived. Thus, the independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Schmidt and Smith et al.

In addition, the cited reference of Smith et al. teaches that the antennas 26 are connected to a single switch, i.e., the RF switch. Thus, the cited reference of Smith et al. also fails to disclose “*an antenna terminal having a plurality of antennas connected to respective switches,*” as recited in the independent claim 1, which further supports the conclusion that the independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Schmidt and Smith et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the independent claims 20, 29 and 30, which recite limitations similar to the limitations of the independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 20, 29 and 30 are also not obvious in view of the cited references of Schmidt and Smith et al., and requests that the independent claims 20, 29 and 30 be allowed as well.

II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-11, 13-18 and 21-23

Each of the dependent claims 2-11, 13-18 and 21-23 depends on one of the independent claims 1 and 20. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Thus, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional reasons.

As an example, the dependent claim 2 recites “*wherein the signal processor is an analogue-digital signal processor formed by a direct digital synthesizer driven phase locked loop radio frequency signal generator,*” which is not disclose in the cited references of Schmidt and Smith et al. The cited passage (column 4, lines 49-

53, and column 6, lines 23-35) of Schmidt fails to disclose “*a direct digital synthesizer driven phase locked loop radio frequency signal generator*,” as recited in the dependent claim 2. Thus, the dependent claim 2 is not obvious in view of Schmidt and Smith et al.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Harald Fischer

Date: July 24, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300